UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/804,852	03/19/2004	Lauri Paatero	915-008.022	7439

4955   7590   04/18/2008
WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & ADOLPHSON, LLP
BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5
755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224
MONROE, CT 06468

EXAMINER
NALVEN, ANDREW L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2134	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/18/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *3/3/08*.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1 and 4-14* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) *1, 4-14* is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on *09 July 2007* is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some *   c) ☐ None of:
      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1, 4-14 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 3/3/2008 have been fully considered but they are

moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   **Claims 1, 4-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over

Grohoski et al US PGPub 2004/0225885 in view of Srinivasan et al US PGPub

2004/0158742.

4.   **With regards to claims 1, 11-12, 14,** Grohoski teaches an electronic device

comprising (Grohoski, paragraph 0056, paragraph 0106, crypto processor), an

accelerator for accelerating cryptographic data processing operations, which

acceleration is arranged with (Grohoski, paragraph 0056, higher speed encryption and

decryption processes enabled using crypto coprocessor) a first logical interface over

which data to be processed is provided (Grohoski, paragraphs 0061-0062, transfers

crypto packet), a secure second logical interface over which cryptographic keys

employed in the operation of processing data is provided (Grohoski, paragraph 0062,

paragraph 0052, control queue, paragraphs 0056-0057, sharing access to registers and

memory access units provides a secure connection, paragraph 0106, controlled access

to secure registers), and wherein the first logical interface and the secure second logical

interface share a same physical interface (Grohoski, paragraph 0056, share same

memory access units). Grohoski fails to teach a configuration register arranged to

indicate to the accelerator whether secure mode or normal mode is set by the processor

arranged in the device. However, Srinivasan teaches a configuration register arranged

to indicate to the accelerator whether secure mode or normal mode is set by the

processor and configured to receive mode setting instructions from a protected

application, said processor arranged in the device (Srinivasan, paragraphs 0121, 0127,

0133). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art to utilize Srinivasan's method of providing secure operation

modes for a processor because it offers the advantage of ensuring that only authorized

application software is executed and only authorized multimedia content is rendered

(Srinivasan, paragraph 0007).

5.   **With regards to claim 4**, Grohoski as modified teaches the configuration

register is further arranged such that is may be set in one of a plurality of possible

encryption modes, the accelerator being arranged to operate in the encryption mode set

in the register (Grohoski, paragraph 0116, encryption type field).

6.   **With regards to claim 5**, Grohoski teaches the accelerator is arranged such that

the first logical interface and the secure second logical interface are provided via

respective physical interfaces (Grohoski, Figure 2 Items 215 and 210).

7.   **With regards to claim 6**, Grohoski as modified teaches the first logical interface

of the accelerator is arranged such that it is accessible by any application while the

secure second logical interface of the accelerator is arranged such that it is accessible

by protected applications only (Srinivasan, paragraphs 0007, 0121, 0127, 0133).

8.   **With regards to claim 7**, Grohoski as modified teaches protected applications

prevent other applications from accessing the accelerator (Grohoski, paragraph 0106).

9.   **With regards to claim 8**, Grohoski as modified teaches protected applications

are applications which are allowed to execute in the secure execution environment

(Aaro, column 4 lines 55-61).

10.   **With regards to claim 9**, Grohoski as modified teaches storage circuitry

arranged with at least one storage area in which protected data relating to device

security is located (Grohoski, paragraph 0106), a processor arranged such that is may

be set in one of at least two separate operating modes (Srinivasan, paragraphs 0007,

0121, 0127, 0133) and the device further arranged such that the processor is given

access to said storage area when a normal processor operating mode is set

(Srinivasan, paragraphs 0007, 0121, 0127, 0133) and the processor is denied access to

said storage area when a normal processor operating mode is set (Srinivasan,

paragraphs 0007, 0121, 0127, 0133) and the processor is capable of accessing the

secure second logical interface of the accelerator when the secure processor operating

mode is set (Srinivasan, paragraphs 0007, 0121, 0127, 0133).

11.   **With regards to claim 10**, Grohoski as modified teaches the protected

applications controlling the processor operation mode (Srinivasan, paragraph 0010).

12.   **With regards to claims 13**, Grohoski teaches the acceleration arranged such

that the first logical interface and the secure second logical interface share a same

physical interface (Grohoski, paragraphs 0102-0103, access using the interface include

both keys and source data, paragraph 0056, share same memory access units).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to ANDREW L. NALVEN whose telephone number is

(571)272-3839. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 8-6,

Alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kambiz Zand can be reached on 571 272 3811. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Andrew L Nalven/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2134